Sabda, Logic, and Truth Governance: The Cohesive Tetrad for Law and Artificial Intelligence

Ade Zaenal Mutaqin
Faculty of Economics and Business, Pakuan University, Bogor, Indonesia
Corresponding author: suratkiade@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0001-4114-3679

Abstrak

This article addresses a structural tension at the heart of contemporary truth governance. Modern institutions of science, law, and artificial intelligence often rely on an implicit architecture of pure logic that combines scientism, hard evidentialism, a strict fact value divide, and strong naturalism about human telos and dignity. Drawing on the canonical formulation of The Cohesive Tetrad, the article develops an alternative architecture in which Sabda (Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos), logic, Qualia, Mistika as the intentional spiritual dimension of journeying toward direct encounter with the transcendent, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment are treated as distinct yet interdependent domains of truth. Methodologically, the study adopts a normative conceptual design grounded in minimal human dignity axioms, reconstructs the architecture of pure logic, and then tests both architectures against these axioms. The analysis is applied to two critical arenas, namely legal rationality and the governance of artificial intelligence, in order to compare how each architecture organises purpose, constraint, and long term moral trace. The article argues that law and AI built solely on pure logic are structurally prone to procedural absolutism, epistemic injustice, legitimation vacuums, and algorithmic intensification of existing harms, whereas law and AI situated within The Cohesive Tetrad can re anchor norm and telos in Sabda, integrate experiential and spiritual dimensions of truth, and enforce accountability through observable configurations of Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment over time.

Keywords: *truth governance; Sabda; logic; human dignity; legal rationality; artificial intelligence governance; Qualia; Mistika; Akhlak; Intention-Trace Alignment; The Cohesive Tetrad.*

1. Introduction

Debates about truth, evidence, and legitimacy have moved from seminar rooms into the centre of institutional life. Courts rely on expert witnesses and probabilistic tools, governments appeal to data driven policy, and platforms deploy machine learning models to filter information and steer behaviour. At first sight, this landscape appears to vindicate an old promise of rational modernity. If institutions are guided by logic, supported by evidence, and insulated from arbitrary passion, then truth governance should become more reliable and more just. Yet public distrust, epistemic polarisation, and recurrent crises in law and artificial intelligence suggest that something deeper is amiss.

A growing body of philosophical and empirical work has begun to question the sufficiency of an implicit architecture of pure logic that underwrites many of these developments. This architecture combines scientism, hard evidentialism, a strict separation between fact and value, and a strong naturalism concerning human telos and dignity (Putnam, 2002; Haack, 2003; MacIntyre, 1988). It treats rationality primarily as formal coherence and evidential support, while moral and spiritual sources of normativity are relegated to the private sphere or translated into soft preferences. In practice, however, law and artificial intelligence continue to invoke thick notions of dignity, justice, and responsibility that cannot be fully explained or justified within this architecture. The same institutions that speak the language of neutrality and optimisation must also promise to respect persons, protect the vulnerable, and answer for their long term moral trace.

This tension has become particularly visible in two arenas. In law, theories of legal rationality have sought to secure legitimacy through coherent rules, principled interpretation, and fair procedures (Fuller, 1964; Dworkin, 1986; Habermas, 1996). Yet experiences of procedural injustice, epistemic exclusion, and selective enforcement reveal that formal rationality alone is not enough to safeguard dignity and trust (Fricker, 2007). In artificial intelligence, ethical frameworks and policy guidelines insist on fairness, accountability, and respect for human rights (Jobin et al., 2019; Floridi and Cowls, 2019; OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021). At the same time, algorithmic systems amplify historical bias, manipulate attention, and reduce persons to data points in optimisation functions (O'Neil, 2016; Mittelstadt et al., 2016). The language of pure logic appears powerful, but its institutional embodiments repeatedly fall short of the moral expectations they themselves invoke.

The Cohesive Tetrad is proposed as a response to this structural deficit. Developed in previous philosophical and preprint work (Mutaqin, 2025a; Mutaqin, 2025b), The Cohesive Tetrad articulates four interlocking domains of truth and practice. Sabda is defined as Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos. Logic organises reasons and tests coherence. Qualia concerns the experiential dimension of truth as it is lived and suffered by persons and communities. Mistika is defined as Mistika, the intentional spiritual dimension of journeying toward direct encounter with the transcendent. These four domains are examined through Akhlak as observable moral character and through Intention-Trace Alignment as the degree of alignment between epistemic intention and epistemic moral trace over time. Instead of allowing one domain to dominate the others, The Cohesive Tetrad proposes an architecture in which each has a distinct role and none can legitimately claim absolute sovereignty.

The present article does not merely describe The Cohesive Tetrad as a set of ideas. It treats it as an architecture of truth governance and brings it into direct confrontation with the

architecture of pure logic that currently shapes law and artificial intelligence. The central claim is not that logic should be rejected, but that logic cannot bear the burden of grounding telos and dignity on its own. Logic must be repositioned as a disciplined medium inside an architecture led by Sabda, informed by Qualia, purified by Mistika, and audited through Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment. Only under such an architecture can institutions credibly claim to respect inviolable human dignity while using complex forms of reasoning and technology.

Methodologically, the article adopts a normative conceptual design. First, it reconstructs from the literature the implicit architecture of pure logic that informs much of contemporary thinking about law and artificial intelligence, and formulates a set of minimal human dignity axioms that any plausible architecture of truth governance must satisfy. Second, it reconstructs The Cohesive Tetrad as an explicit architecture by defining its core domains, clarifying their relations, and specifying the role of Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment as long term diagnostics. Third, it tests both architectures against the dignity axioms and applies them to two critical arenas, namely legal rationality and the governance of artificial intelligence. The question is not whether Sabda or logic is more important in the abstract, but how different architectures of their relationship shape the purposes, constraints, and moral traces of concrete institutions.

The contribution of the article is threefold. Conceptually, it offers a structured way to think about truth governance that neither collapses normativity into private belief nor reduces it to procedural regularity. It shows that many existing critiques of scientism, proceduralism, and algorithmic harm can be consolidated into a diagnosis of architectural failure. Normatively, it argues that The Cohesive Tetrad provides a more coherent and humanly adequate architecture for organising Sabda, logic, Qualia, Mistika, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment under minimal human dignity axioms. Applied to law and artificial intelligence, it demonstrates how this architecture leads to different design choices regarding legal procedures, evidential standards, algorithmic objectives, and accountability mechanisms. In doing so, the article invites further work on how Sabda and logic can be integrated in the governance of institutions that increasingly shape the conditions under which truth, justice, and humanity are lived.

2. The Ideology of Pure Logic

The argument of this article requires that the opponent be described with as much fairness as possible. If the ideology of pure logic is only a caricature, then defeating it would mean very little. This section therefore reconstructs pure logic as a recognisable and historically plausible constellation of claims about science, reason, and human dignity. Only after that reconstruction can the later critique be taken seriously.

2.1. The aspiration to purity

At the heart of pure logic lies an aspiration that is, in itself, noble. Human beings have seen too many examples of cruelty justified by arbitrary authority, inherited custom, or unexamined passion. In response, modern thought has searched for forms of reasoning that can liberate us from caprice. The dream is simple and powerful: if we can anchor our beliefs and institutions in logic and evidence, then we can free them from superstition, prejudice, and naked power.

This aspiration takes shape in several familiar images. Science is imagined as a project that brackets personal bias, controls subjective interference, and allows nature to speak through

data. Law is imagined as a system in which decisions follow from rules and facts, rather than from the mood or social position of the judge. Public reason is imagined as a forum where only arguments that all rational agents could in principle accept are allowed to carry weight. In each of these images, logic functions as a purifier. It is asked to burn away everything that smells of particularity, emotion, tradition, or revelation.

The ideology of pure logic begins when this aspiration hardens into a doctrine. What started as a call for intellectual discipline slowly becomes a picture of the world in which only one kind of voice is allowed to decide what counts as rational and legitimate. That picture can be articulated through four interrelated components: scientism, hard evidentialism, strict separation between facts and values, and strong naturalism about telos and dignity.

2.2. Four components of pure logic

2.2.1. Scientism

Scientism is not the same as respect for science. It is the belief that the methods and styles of reasoning used in the natural sciences exhaust, or nearly exhaust, what counts as serious knowledge. On this view, if something cannot be investigated using the tools of controlled observation, measurement, and generalisation, then it cannot be known in any robust sense. At best it may be a matter of taste, tradition, or private conviction.

Scientism has understandable roots. The successes of physics, chemistry, and biology are undeniable. Technologies built on these sciences have reshaped human life. It is therefore tempting to treat their methods as the gold standard for all inquiry. The danger begins when this temptation turns into exclusion. Fields that deal with meaning, normativity, or transcendence are told that they must either imitate the surface features of the natural sciences or accept marginal status.

Within the ideology of pure logic, scientism acts as a gatekeeper. It filters out any appeal to Sabda as Revelatory Word, since Sabda does not arrive as an experimentally measurable object among others. It filters out much of Qualia and Mistika as well, since lived experience and intentional orientation toward the transcendent do not look like laboratory data. What remains inside the gate are propositions that can be spoken in a style that resembles the natural sciences.

2.2.2. Hard evidentialism

Hard evidentialism states that a belief is only rationally acceptable if it is proportioned to a body of evidence that could in principle be made explicit and publicly shared. Doubt is the default; trust must be earned. At first glance, this can seem like a simple call to intellectual honesty. We should not believe more strongly than our evidence warrants.

In its stricter forms, however, evidentialism begins to distrust any kind of properly basic trust that is not itself grounded in further arguments. It treats faith as irrational by definition. It also becomes suspicious of moral convictions that are not easily converted into evidential claims. Over time, this produces a picture of rationality in which human agents are expected to live almost entirely in the posture of suspended judgement, except where arguments and data have already spoken.

Within the ideology of pure logic, hard evidentialism supports the idea that Sabda cannot be a source of knowledge. If Sabda is to be considered at all, it must first pass through logical and empirical filters that stand above it as judges. The authority of revelation is therefore inverted. Instead of Sabda judging our use of logic and evidence, logic and evidence are treated as judges over Sabda.

2.2.3. Strict separation between facts and values

The third component is the insistence on a sharp line between facts and values. Facts are taken to describe how the world is. Values express how someone would like the world to be. In the classical form of this distinction, logic and science are thought to occupy the factual side, while morality, religion, and aesthetics are relegated to the realm of subjective or intersubjective preference.

Once again, the initial purpose is understandable. Confusing factual description with moral approval has often led to serious harm. However, the strict separation has side effects. It encourages the thought that truth belongs to the factual side alone, while normativity is left to negotiate for influence without the right to claim truth.

Within the ideology of pure logic, this separation drives a wedge inside human discourse. Statements that belong to Sabda, such as commands, promises, and covenantal claims, are pushed to the value side and stripped of cognitive dignity. Claims about human dignity become difficult to formulate as truths. They begin to look like emphatic preferences: strong feelings backed by social consensus, but not anchored in the structure of reality.

2.2.4. Strong naturalism about telos and dignity

The final component is a strong form of naturalism which holds that all legitimate talk about telos and dignity must eventually be cashed out in natural terms, such as evolutionary fitness, social stability, or psychological well being. On this view, there is no transcendent order of purposes that precedes human choice. Telos is something we project onto the world, not something we receive. Dignity is a useful construct for regulating behaviour, not a reflection of any deeper order.

This naturalism levels the field. Human beings may be more complex than other animals, but they are not different in kind. Whatever special status we grant them must be justified entirely by reference to contingent features of the natural or social world. Once those features change, the status can in principle be renegotiated.

Within the ideology of pure logic, strong naturalism ensures that any claim to a higher telos must be translated into descriptive language. Sabda is not allowed to speak directly about purpose. At most, it becomes an object of study in psychology, sociology, or intellectual history. The authoritative source of norm and telos is now understood to be human preference, aggregated through some rational procedure, or the impersonal process of evolution and adaptation.

2.3. From philosophy to institutional common sense

The four components just described do not usually appear in isolation. They travel together and, over time, become embedded in institutional practices. At that point, the ideology of pure logic no longer needs to be argued explicitly. It solidifies as common sense.

In universities, this appears in the way disciplines are ranked. Fields that resemble the natural sciences are given higher prestige and more resources. Disciplines that work with Sabda, meaning, and normativity are tolerated, sometimes respected for cultural reasons, but quietly treated as less central to the serious business of knowledge. Within such a climate, scholars who wish to be taken seriously often feel pressure to recode their questions in purely logical or empirical terms.

In law, the same ideology appears in the tendency to reduce legal rationality to procedural correctness and evidential sufficiency. The system asks: were the correct rules applied, was the right kind of evidence presented, were the proper steps followed. These questions are crucial, but when they dominate without remainder, the deeper question of whether the legal outcome honours human dignity is pushed to the side or assumed without real scrutiny.

In technology and AI, the ideology appears in the hope that enough data and sophisticated models can replace the need for thick moral judgement. Risk scores, recommendation systems, and predictive policing tools are built on the assumption that if an algorithm is logical, empirically well calibrated, and free from certain technical biases, then its outputs are safe to trust. Questions about whether certain decisions should be automated at all are often left unasked.

In each domain, the same pattern recurs. Logic, understood in a narrow sense as formal and empirical discipline, is given a role that subtly expands from tool to ruler. It decides not only how we should reason about the world, but also which kinds of reasons are allowed to count as public and binding.

2.4. The attractions and strengths of pure logic

It would be a mistake to describe pure logic only in terms of its dangers. The ideology has attractions that are not superficial. If we ignore these, we will underestimate its grip.

First, pure logic promises protection against arbitrariness. When legal or political decisions are justified in terms of shared procedures and publicly accessible evidence, citizens are less vulnerable to the private whims of leaders. Logic seems to offer a shield against tyranny.

Second, pure logic creates a powerful image of unity. If all rational agents are bound by the same norms of inference and by the same body of empirical facts, then in principle the space for deep disagreement can be narrowed. This is especially attractive in plural societies, where appeals to Sabda and tradition are feared as sources of conflict.

Third, pure logic appears to be inclusive. Anyone can in principle learn the rules of inference and the methods of empirical investigation. No one needs to belong to a particular community of faith or to share a thick cultural heritage in order to participate in rational discourse.

These strengths are real. The critique developed in this article does not deny them. It will instead argue that the very goods which pure logic wishes to protect cannot finally be sustained within its own ideological boundaries. Once logic claims sovereignty over all domains of truth, the shield begins to crack. The unity it promises becomes fragile. The inclusiveness it seeks to secure turns out to be incomplete, because it forces many citizens to split their deepest convictions from their public reasoning.

2.5. Summary

The ideology of pure logic can therefore be summarised as follows. It is an ensemble of commitments that elevate a particular style of rationality, born from the legitimate successes of science, into a universal standard. Scientism narrows the field of serious knowledge to what looks like the natural sciences. Hard evidentialism distrusts any properly basic trust that is not grounded in explicit arguments and evidence. The strict separation of facts and values strips moral and revelatory claims of cognitive dignity. Strong naturalism about telos and dignity disallows any appeal to a transcendent source of norm.

Once these commitments are institutionalised, Sabda is either privatised, studied as a psychological or historical object, or functionally silenced. Qualia is compressed into metrics and indicators. Mistika is confined to the interior life with no recognised role in public reasoning. Logic, in its narrow form, is crowned as the only fully legitimate language of truth.

The next section will argue that this crown is too heavy for logic to bear. By examining the inner tensions of scientism, evidentialism, fact value separation, and naturalism, we will see that pure logic cannot finally support the very claims it wishes to defend. This will open the space in which The Cohesive Tetrad can be introduced, not as a rejection of logic, but as an architecture in which logic finds its rightful dignity under the horizon of Sabda, Qualia, and Mistika.

3. An Internal Critique of Pure Logic

The ideology of pure logic presents itself as a friend of clarity. It claims to remove confusion by insisting that only what can be logically argued and empirically supported deserves the name of knowledge. In this section, I do not oppose that ambition from outside. Instead, I ask what happens when pure logic turns its tools upon itself. Can it justify its own norms of inference, its own demands for evidence, its separation of facts and values, and its naturalism about telos and dignity, without secretly relying on what it claims to exclude?

The answer, I will argue, is no. When examined patiently, each pillar of pure logic turns out to lean on forms of trust, normativity, and depth that it cannot generate from within its own picture of the world. The critique is internal in spirit. It is logic that exposes the overreach of logic.

3.1. The problem of self grounding

Any system that demands reasons must eventually face a simple but unforgiving question. What justifies the very norms of reasoning that the system presupposes? If every belief must be supported by a further argument, and every argument must rest on prior norms of inference,

then the chain either continues forever, collapses into circularity, or stops at something that is not itself grounded by another argument.

Pure logic tries to live by the first two options. It treats circularity as a vice and infinite regress as a problem, yet it continues to speak as if its own norms of inference are self evidently binding on any rational agent. When asked why the law of non contradiction, or the demand for consistent probability assignments, or the rules of empirical confirmation should be obeyed, the answer usually shifts into a different register. Either one is told that to deny such norms is "irrational by definition", or that abandoning them would make coherent practice impossible. In both cases, the system has stopped at a commitment that is not itself justified by a further argument. This structure mirrors long standing debates in epistemology about regress, foundationalism, and the limits of pure coherentism, where even the most rigorous accounts concede that some commitments must be received rather than derived (Haack, 2003; Putnam, 2002).

None of this is peculiar to logic. Every practice, including the practice of receiving Sabda, lives from some starting points that are not deduced from prior premises. The problem for pure logic arises only when it denies this fact. It presents itself as a view from nowhere, a practice that can, in principle, give reasons for everything it accepts. Yet its own life depends on a bedrock of trust in certain patterns of inference, in certain forms of experience, and in the very capacity of human minds to track truth. When logic refuses to acknowledge this dependence, it obscures its kinship with other forms of committed reception.

3.2. The limits of hard evidentialism

Hard evidentialism insists that rational belief must proportion itself strictly to publicly shareable evidence. In its more moderate forms, this principle is a healthy discipline against wishful thinking. In its stricter formulations, however, it begins to unravel under its own weight.

Consider simple cases. A scientist believes that her instruments are generally reliable, that the reported results of reputable colleagues are not wholesale fabrications, that the journal she reads did not randomly swap figures between manuscripts. These beliefs are not supported, in every case, by independent investigations. They are sustained by a network of trust, professional norms, and accumulated experience. If she were required to produce explicit evidence for every node in this network before treating any of it as rationally admissible, she would never be able to begin.

The same applies to ordinary life. Most people trust their memories often enough to act, without reconstructing a chain of arguments each morning to prove that they really did lock the door yesterday. They trust the testimony of others, within reason, without demanding a full chain of evidence every time a simple fact is communicated. They trust that the meanings of words will not spontaneously invert from one day to the next. Empirical work on motivated reasoning and questionable research practices confirms that agents do not simply proportion every belief to formally available evidence, but negotiate it through a mixture of trust, virtue, and vulnerability (Kunda, 1990; John et al., 2012).

Hard evidentialism, pushed to its own limit, cannot justify these trusts without self defeat. If it demands explicit evidence for every belief, including the belief that evidence is a reliable guide,

then it collapses into scepticism. If it exempts some beliefs from that demand because they are "practically necessary", then it has already acknowledged that not all rational commitment is grounded in the same way.

What actually happens in scientific and everyday reasoning is more subtle. Certain forms of trust function as starting points. They are not blind leaps, but enduring orientations that can be refined and corrected over time. They resemble, in miniature and in a limited way, the structure of Sabda. They are not deduced from evidence. They are received and then tested in practice.

Pure logic depends heavily on such trusts, yet its official story has trouble admitting this. It prefers to speak as if everything stands or falls with explicit argument and evidence, even though its own existence as a practice already presupposes more than it can prove.

3.3. The entanglement of facts and values

The ideology of pure logic rests on a clean line between facts and values. Facts describe how things are. Values express preferences about how things should be. Logic and science belong on the factual side. Sabda and morality are grouped with values and treated as secondary. This division promises clarity. It allows logic to claim that it deals with truth, while values become matters of choice.

In practice, however, the line is much less clean. Scientific work begins with decisions about which phenomena are worth measuring, which differences matter, and which outcomes count as significant. These are not purely factual questions. They involve judgements about relevance and importance. The way a study of unemployment is designed, for example, reflects value laden assumptions about which lives and activities count as "employment" and why.

Even the selection and use of categories in science carries normative weight. Classifying behaviours, bodies, or cultures involves choices that can reinforce or challenge existing patterns of power. Describing a pattern as "disorder" rather than "difference", or as "risk" rather than "variation", is not a neutral act. The categories we use to describe facts shape what we perceive as problems and what we treat as acceptable.

Legal practice shows the same entanglement. A court does not simply discover facts and then apply rules like a machine. It decides which facts are relevant, which testimonies are credible, and which harms are serious enough to merit redress. These decisions are guided by normative understandings of dignity, responsibility, and fairness. If those understandings are treated as mere preferences, the entire claim that law is more than organised force begins to erode.

When facts and values are thus intertwined, it becomes difficult to maintain the idea that truth belongs exclusively on the factual side. Values are present at every stage of inquiry, not only at the moment of drawing moral conclusions. They guide attention, shape concepts, and inform judgements of significance. This does not mean that anything goes. It means that the pursuit of truth is already normatively structured, whether we admit it or not. Philosophers of science have shown that such value laden choices are not accidental noise but structural features of inquiry itself (Putnam, 2002; MacIntyre, 1988).

Pure logic can respond by insisting that these value elements should themselves be brought under rational control, perhaps through procedures of public justification or consensus. That

response is important, but it does not erase the basic point. There is no view from nowhere. Even the attempt to regulate values rationally presupposes some prior sense of what counts as a good reason and a justifiable arrangement. At that depth, the clean separation between facts and values starts to look like a convenient fiction.

From the perspective of The Cohesive Tetrad, this is exactly what we should expect. Qualia reminds us that experience and evaluation are never entirely separable. Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment show that how we seek and use knowledge is already a moral matter. Sabda provides the horizon within which values are not mere preferences, but responses to a prior order of norm and telos. When pure logic denies this, it does not remove normativity. It merely obscures its sources.

3.4. Dignity without depth

Perhaps the most revealing test for pure logic is the case of human dignity. Modern legal and political orders frequently appeal to dignity as the ground of rights that cannot be traded away. Constitutions, treaties, and court decisions speak as if there were something in the human being that demands respect regardless of social status, productivity, or usefulness. This language functions, in effect, as a kind of secularised Sabda. It names a claim that does not originate in human agreement alone. Contemporary human rights instruments and ethics frameworks for artificial intelligence invoke dignity in precisely this quasi foundational way, often treating it as the non negotiable basis for rights and constraints on power (Jobin et al., 2019; Floridi and Cowls, 2019; OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021).

Within the ideology of pure logic, however, it is difficult to explain why such language should be taken at face value. If all normativity must be expressed in naturalistic terms, then dignity must eventually be reduced to something like social consensus, evolutionary advantage, or psychological well being. Each of these reductions carries a cost.

If dignity is grounded in consensus, then its content is only as stable as the agreement that supports it. When groups with different interests negotiate, the strong may manage to reshape the consensus in ways that erode protections for the vulnerable. In such a case, the language of "inviolable" rights begins to look like rhetoric that hides the underlying play of power.

If dignity is grounded in evolutionary advantage, it becomes a moving target. Traits that are advantageous in one ecological or technological context may be disadvantageous in another. There is no particular reason, within a strict evolutionary frame, to treat all members of the species as equally worthy of respect. Those whose traits are judged less adaptive might then be accorded weaker claims.

If dignity is grounded in psychological well being, it risks collapsing into a form of refined preference satisfaction. Protecting dignity becomes equivalent to ensuring that individuals feel respected and valued. While this is not trivial, it does not reach the level of an unconditional claim. In situations where the satisfaction of some would require serious costs from others, mere well being does not explain why some harms should never be done, even if they would produce large aggregate benefits.

In practice, courts and human rights bodies often treat dignity as if it had a depth that none of these reductions can capture. They speak as if there were indeed a telos inscribed in the human

being that places limits on what can be done to a person, even by a unanimous decision of a majority. They act as if some things are wrong, not only by current consensus, but by a standard that judges consensus.

Pure logic depends on this deeper grammar, yet cannot generate it. It can describe how dignity talk functions, it can measure its social effects, it can incorporate it into decision procedures. But it cannot, on its own grounds, explain why dignity should be honoured when it conflicts with collective interest or individual preference. In requiring logic to fill this role, the ideology of pure logic demands from logic a kind of authority that logic itself cannot justify.

From the standpoint of The Cohesive Tetrad, this is evidence of a hidden Sabda. Modern institutions continue to act as if there were an order of norm and telos that precedes human agreement. They do not call it revelation, but they treat it as something that speaks with more than human authority. The gap between their official allegiance to pure logic and their practical reliance on quasi revelatory dignity language is a sign of internal tension, not of stable balance.

3.5. Interim conclusion: logic at the edge of its mandate

The internal critique developed in this section can be stated briefly. Pure logic, when it tries to serve as the sole sovereign of rationality, finds itself in a position it cannot defend without covert help. It depends on forms of trust that it cannot derive from its own methods. It works within a field of entangled facts and values that it did not create. It relies on concepts of dignity and telos that carry more weight than its naturalistic vocabulary can bear.

None of this means that logic is dispensable. On the contrary, the analysis shows how much we need logical disciplines to clarify, test, and restrain our claims. What fails is not logic itself, but the attempt to make logic the only legitimate language of truth. When logic is asked to carry that burden, it either collapses into scepticism or borrows, without acknowledgment, from the very domains it pretends to leave behind.

This is the opening in which The Cohesive Tetrad must be placed. The problem is not that logic is too strong, but that it has been given the wrong office. It has been treated as a king, when in reality it is called to be a minister. The task of the next section is to present The Cohesive Tetrad as an architecture in which Sabda, Logic, Qualia, and Mistika can each exercise their proper role in truth governance, with Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment serving as long term diagnostics of integrity.

4. The Cohesive Tetrad as an Architecture of Truth Governance

The internal critique of pure logic leaves us with an unresolved task. We have seen that the ideology of pure logic cannot fully justify its own norms of inference, cannot contain the entanglement of facts and values, and cannot ground the depth of human dignity that modern institutions presuppose. Yet critique by itself is not enough. If pure logic is not sufficient as an architecture of truth governance, what can take its place without collapsing into arbitrariness or nostalgia.

The Cohesive Tetrad is proposed as an answer to that architectural question, not as a loose metaphor but as a structured configuration of domains of truth that can be examined and contested. Building on earlier work that introduced The Cohesive Tetrad as a philosophical and

ethical framework for truth governance (Mutaqin, 2025a, 2025b), this section presents the framework explicitly as an architecture. It distinguishes six core elements and their relations:

1. Sabda as Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos.
2. Logic as the domain of formal and inferential reasoning.
3. Qualia as the field of lived, embodied, and social experience.
4. Mistika as Mistika, the intentional spiritual dimension of journeying toward direct encounter with the transcendent.
5. Akhlak as the observable moral character that emerges over time.
6. Intention-Trace Alignment as Intention-Trace Alignment, the degree of alignment between epistemic intention and epistemic moral trace.

The aim of this section is descriptive and evaluative at once. It describes how The Cohesive Tetrad understands truth as articulated across several domains, and it evaluates how such an arrangement can make better sense of existing practices of law and artificial intelligence than the ideology of pure logic. The movement is from a monolingual picture of truth to a multi domain picture in which each domain has its own integrity and its own characteristic distortions when it is isolated.

4.1. From monolingual to multi domain truth

Under the ideology of pure logic, truth is imagined as a monolingual regime. There is one proper language of serious discourse, namely the language of logic and empirical science. Moral and spiritual vocabularies may have expressive or motivational value, but they are not treated as carriers of truth in the same sense. At best, they are translated into more neutral terms; at worst, they are relegated to private conviction.

The Cohesive Tetrad proposes a different picture. It begins from the observation that in actual human life, claims to truth already come in several registers. There are assertions that certain events really happened, that certain causal relations really obtain, that certain actions are truly just or unjust, that certain experiences manifest grace or abandonment, that certain lives exhibit integrity or corruption. These are not simply different feelings about the same neutral facts. They are different kinds of truth claim.

Within the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad, these different kinds of claim are not forced into one mould, nor are they left in chaos. Each domain is named, given a distinct role, and placed in relation to the others.

Sabda names the primary source of norm and telos. It denotes the conviction that human beings are addressed by a Word they did not invent, a Word that speaks with authority about what they are for and how they may live.

Logic names the practices through which claims are articulated, connected, tested, and systematised, including the disciplines of formal inference and empirical confirmation.

Qualia names the domain in which the consequences of truth claims are felt and observed in personal and communal life, including the atmosphere of trust, fear, hope, and harm that accumulates around institutions and technologies.

Mistika names the orientation and purification of intention in the search for truth and in the exercise of power, including the disciplines by which communities scrutinise the loves and fears that steer their reasoning.

Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment provide the long term diagnostics. They ask whether the character formed by a regime of truth and the observable traces of its actions over time genuinely correspond to the telos it professes.

Moving from a monolingual to a multi domain regime does not mean that anything counts as truth. It means that claims are judged within the domain to which they belong and in their relations to other domains. The question is no longer whether logic alone can decide everything, but whether logic is well positioned within the whole architecture.

4.2. Sabda: the authoritative source of norm and telos

Sabda, in the sense used here, refers to Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos. It does not refer only to one religious tradition or one corpus of sacred texts. It denotes the more basic conviction that human beings are addressed by a Word they did not author, a Word that both calls and commands, promises and judges.

Several clarifications are necessary.

First, Sabda is not opposed to rationality. It is not a licence for arbitrariness. In many traditions, the reception of revelation is accompanied by rigorous disciplines of interpretation, argument, and moral testing (Nasr, 1989; Taylor, 1989). Sabda does not abolish the need for argument, interpretation, and evidence. What it does is to establish that some truths, especially those concerning ultimate telos and inviolable dignity, are not inferred from human preferences or social contracts but received as binding.

Second, Sabda is not simply one domain of discourse among others. It occupies a structurally superior position in The Cohesive Tetrad. When Sabda speaks credibly about norm and telos, it tells us not only what kinds of actions are permitted or forbidden, but what kinds of life count as wise or foolish, and what purposes can claim to be worthy of a human being. Without such a source, institutions tend to oscillate between thin proceduralism and thick but unstable moralities constructed from shifting consensus. The persistent appeal to human dignity in legal and political discourse can be read as an implicit recognition that something like Sabda is needed, even when the name is not used (Habermas, 2008; UNESCO, 2021).

Third, Sabda is not self interpreting. It is always received through history, language, and community. Different traditions and schools develop competing accounts of what Sabda requires in particular circumstances. For that reason, The Cohesive Tetrad does not romanticise Sabda as a pure voice that bypasses human mediation. Rather, it places Sabda at the head of an architecture that includes logic, Qualia, Mistika, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment as instruments of testing, correction, and purification. Misuse of revelation, including violent or oppressive interpretations, can and must be judged by their failure to align with the telos and character that Sabda itself proclaims.

From the perspective of The Cohesive Tetrad, modern institutions often live on a hidden Sabda. They appeal to unconditional dignity and non negotiable rights, they speak about wrongs that

cannot be justified even by majority will, yet they are reluctant to name any source of norm and telos beyond human agreement (Putnam, 2002; Jobin et al., 2019). The task of this architecture is not to impose one religious tradition on public life, but to make explicit the dependence of truth governance on a source deeper than consensus and to bring that dependence under disciplined governance.

4.3. Logic: disciplined instrument and shared medium

In the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad, logic is given a role that is both honoured and limited. It is honoured as a disciplined craft that clarifies claims, tests coherence, and makes disagreement visible. It is limited in that it is not allowed to define norm and telos on its own.

Logic serves at least three central functions.

First, logic is a clarifying instrument. It forces vague appeals to Sabda, experience, or conscience to take a form that can be examined: propositions, arguments, models, and procedures. In this role, logic protects Sabda from being reduced to slogans and protects Qualia from being dismissed as mere feeling. Clarification does not equal reduction, but without clarification, self deception is far too easy.

Second, logic is a testing instrument. It examines whether claims about revelation, experience, or institutional design are internally coherent and whether their premises actually support the conclusions drawn from them. In law and artificial intelligence this includes scrutiny of legal arguments, policy justifications, and algorithmic models. Logic reveals when pious language hides contradictions, when noble intentions clash with actual rules, and when models produce patterns of harm that their creators deny (Fuller, 1964; O'Neil, 2016; Mittelstadt et al., 2016).

Third, logic is a shared medium in plural settings. In societies where citizens are formed by different traditions of Sabda and different histories of suffering, the space of public reasoning cannot rely on one sacred language. Logic provides a partial common ground. It does not erase deep disagreements, but it offers a grammar in which those disagreements can be articulated and contested without immediate resort to force. In this sense, logic cooperates with discursive ideals in legal and political theory that seek public justification across worldviews (Habermas, 1996).

The crucial point is that logic does not generate telos. It cannot, by itself, tell us what human beings are for or why certain harms are intolerable. Logic can show that some goals are inconsistent or self defeating, it can reveal that certain policies contradict declared principles, but it cannot confer intrinsic worth on persons. In The Cohesive Tetrad, logic is therefore relieved of the impossible task of grounding ultimate purposes and returned to its rightful task of serving them.

4.4. Qualia: experiential registration and evaluative feedback

Qualia, in this framework, names the domain of lived, embodied, and communal experience. It includes the felt sense of safety or threat in a neighbourhood, the atmosphere of trust or fear in a courtroom, the dignity or humiliation experienced by those subjected to an algorithmic decision, and the long term patterns of hope or despair that cluster around institutions. Qualia

is not only about individual sentiments. It is the invisible atmosphere that a regime of truth produces over time.

Under the ideology of pure logic, Qualia tends to be treated as noise. Experiences are important because they can be measured and aggregated, but their qualitative texture is not recognised as a domain of truth. The aim is to convert feelings into data points that can be processed by the same logic as any other variable. The result is a loss of sensitivity. Situations in which procedures are formally fair but experientially oppressive are hard to describe, and therefore hard to correct (Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2013).

Within The Cohesive Tetrad, Qualia has three main functions.

First, it operates as a field of registration. It registers how regimens of law, policy, and technology are actually lived. Testimonies of those who bear the heaviest burdens, patterns of trauma or resilience, and shifts in communal trust all become part of the truth record. When communities report that a legal system or an algorithmic practice consistently produces fear, humiliation, or invisibility, Qualia signals possible misalignment, even if the underlying rules look tidy on paper (O'Neil, 2016; Zuboff, 2019).

Second, Qualia provides reasons that are not simply reducible to formal arguments. A survivor's account of how a process felt, a community's narrative about how a platform has reshaped its relationships, or a patient's description of how a medical protocol erodes agency are not mere emotions. They are sources of knowledge about what a system is doing to persons. Such experiential knowledge is not infallible, but it is not irrational. It can and must be weighed in light of Sabda, logic, and Mistika.

Third, Qualia connects Sabda and institutional design. Sabda speaks about mercy, justice, and care for the vulnerable. Qualia reveals whether institutions that invoke such language actually manifest those qualities. When there is persistent divergence between official commitments and lived experience, Qualia presses for reform. It also provides a field in which communities can learn to perceive more accurately, to name subtle forms of harm, and to resist narratives that normalise injustice.

In this way, Qualia acts as a continuous evaluative feedback loop. It asks not only whether decisions are formally correct, but what kind of world is being produced when this regime of truth is applied.

4.5. Mistika: purification of intention and depth of seeking

Mistika refers to Mistika, the intentional spiritual dimension of journeying toward direct encounter with the transcendent. In The Cohesive Tetrad, Mistika focuses on the orientation of the heart and will in the search for truth and in the exercise of authority. It draws attention to the fact that reasoning is always carried by agents, and agents are moved by loves, fears, and loyalties that shape what they are willing to see.

This domain matters because the use of logic and evidence is never purely mechanical. Two scholars can work with the same data and the same methods yet reach very different conclusions because their underlying intentions diverge. One may be animated by a desire for status or victory, another by a desire to understand and to serve. The patterns of motivated

reasoning documented in psychology are symptoms of this deeper layer, where the will quietly steers perception and argument (Kunda, 1990).

Mistika names both a diagnostic and a corrective dimension. As diagnosis, it asks uncomfortable questions. Why is this inquiry being pursued. What kind of self and community are being formed through this practice of reasoning. Which loves, fears, and loyalties are silently steering the way evidence is selected, handled, and presented. As correction, Mistika points to the disciplines that different traditions have developed in order to purify intention: practices of examination of conscience, communal discernment, ascetic restraint, and humble listening to those who suffer.

In relation to law and artificial intelligence, Mistika requires that designers, judges, and policymakers examine the spiritual shape of their work. A legal scholar can produce formally impeccable arguments in defence of a policy that quietly entrenches contempt for certain groups. An engineer can optimise a recommender system in ways that increase engagement at the cost of deepening addiction and polarisation. In both cases, there may be no obvious logical error, yet there is a misalignment between intention and the telos revealed in Sabda. Mistika places such misalignments within the field of truth governance rather than leaving them in the realm of private morality.

4.6. Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment: long term diagnostics

Akhlak in this framework refers to the observable moral character of persons and communities that emerges over time under a regime of truth. It includes traits such as honesty, courage, mercy, and intellectual humility. Intention-Trace Alignment adds a further dimension. It examines the degree of alignment between epistemic intention and epistemic moral trace, that is, between what agents say they seek in their pursuit of knowledge and the actual patterns of effect their practices leave behind in the world.

Together, Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment function as slow but powerful diagnostics. They are concerned less with isolated decisions and more with trajectories. They allow us to ask questions such as: over years or decades, what kind of people does this regime of truth form. Are the stated norms and telos embodied in actual practices. When there is a mismatch, is it accidental, or is it structural.

This diagnostic emphasis resonates with developments in virtue epistemology and the empirical study of intellectual character, which have argued that stable dispositions such as intellectual humility and open mindedness are central to reliable inquiry (Zagzebski, 1996; Roberts and Wood, 2007; Baehr, 2011; Krumrei-Mancuso and Rouse, 2016). The Cohesive Tetrad extends this concern beyond individual agents to institutions. It asks what kind of Akhlak is statistically encouraged or discouraged by particular legal procedures or technological architectures, and whether the long term trace of those systems aligns with their professed intentions.

If the architecture of truth governance is sound, occasional failures will occur but persistent patterns of hypocrisy should be corrected. When, by contrast, decades of evidence show that certain procedures routinely produce deception, cruelty, or epistemic arrogance, Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment treat this not as incidental noise but as a sign that the architecture

itself is misaligned. The distance between what is said and what is lived will not close until the underlying arrangement of domains is revised.

This diagnostic function is important because it honours time. Many harms of law and technology become visible only after long use. By incorporating long term character and trace into the very definition of truth governance, The Cohesive Tetrad resists the temptation to judge systems solely at the point of decision, and insists on following their moral wake.

4.7. Structural relations inside The Cohesive Tetrad

The domains of The Cohesive Tetrad are not loosely associated ideas. They stand in structured relations that matter for truth governance.

There is, first, a vertical relation of authority. Sabda stands at the top as Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos. This does not mean that every claimed revelation is automatically true or binding. It means that, within this architecture, any claim about ultimate purpose or inviolable dignity is ultimately tested by its fidelity to Sabda, not by its popularity or short term usefulness. Without this vertical reference, language about dignity risks shrinking into a sophisticated way of describing preferences.

There is, second, a set of horizontal relations of mutual correction. Logic, Qualia, and Mistika question and refine each other. Logic examines whether interpretations of Sabda and narratives of experience are coherent and whether claims about inner purity are consistent with observable behaviour. Qualia reveals when systems that are formally sound still produce patterns of harm that contradict the telos of Sabda. Mistika discloses how pride, fear, or idolatrous attachment to power can distort both logical reasoning and the handling of experience. No domain is left unchecked. Each is given neighbours with the capacity to expose its excesses and blind spots.

Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment operate across these relations as longitudinal audits. They do not add a new domain of content, but a temporal dimension. They ask whether the architecture, as actually implemented, honours its own claims over time. In this sense, The Cohesive Tetrad is not only a map of domains, but a design for ongoing processes of interaction, correction, and assessment.

4.8. How The Cohesive Tetrad answers the failures of pure logic

The earlier critique of pure logic identified at least four structural vulnerabilities. The architecture could not ground its own norms without hidden trust, could not sustain hard evidentialism without collapsing into scepticism, could not maintain a strict fact value divide in practice, and could not give robust account of human dignity. The architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad speaks directly to each of these points.

The problem of self grounding is addressed by recognising that logic and evidence are not self legitimating, but rest on prior reception of Sabda. The commitment to truth and the conviction that reality is intelligible are themselves construed as responses to a Word that calls and authorises inquiry. Logic retains room for philosophical reflection on its own norms, but situates that reflection within a larger horizon.

The limits of hard evidentialism are answered by integrating trust, character, and experience into the structure of rationality. Trust in testimony and institutions, the Akhlak of epistemic agents, and the Qualia of communities affected by decisions are acknowledged as normal components of responsible belief, not as anomalies to be explained away. Evidence remains central, but what counts as evidence is enlarged in a disciplined way.

The entanglement of facts and values is no longer an embarrassment that must be hidden. It becomes an explicit feature of the architecture. The pursuit of truth is seen as always already ethical, because it is guided by Sabda, carried out by agents whose Mistika is never neutral, and evaluated by its effects on communal Qualia and Akhlak. Attempts to pretend that inquiry is value free are treated as forms of self deception, not as ideals.

The fragile status of dignity is strengthened by placing it under Sabda rather than under consensus or utility. Dignity becomes a specification of telos, not a projection of preference. At the same time, dignity claims are not immune from critique. They are subject to scrutiny through Qualia, Mistika, and logic, and their authenticity is tracked by Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment. This combination allows institutions to speak a strong language of inviolable worth without granting unchecked power to any human authority that claims to speak in the name of dignity.

In each case, the solution is not to remove logic, but to lift from logic the demand to be everything. When logic is repositioned within The Cohesive Tetrad, its strengths can be used without overreach, and its weaknesses can be identified and corrected.

4.9. Logic's dignity in a truthful architecture

The picture that emerges is not a humiliation of logic. On the contrary, The Cohesive Tetrad rescues logic from an impossible mandate and grants it a role that is more realistic and more honourable. Logic is no longer asked to provide its own ultimate justification, to purify inquiry from all values, or to breathe moral content into concepts of dignity that do not fit its naturalistic frame.

Instead, logic is honoured as the craft that keeps every domain intellectually honest at the level of structure and inference. It remains essential to science, to law, and to technological design. No interpretation of Sabda, no claim about Qualia, no practice of Mistika, and no judgement about Akhlak is exempt from logical scrutiny. Logic continues to demand coherence, to expose contradiction, and to insist that reasons be offered.

What changes is that logic now operates under a redefined horizon. It is explicitly oriented toward Sabda, receptive to Qualia, chastened by Mistika, and answerable to the long term diagnostics of Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment. Its proper glory lies in serving a truth that is larger than itself rather than pretending to be the whole of truth.

In this sense, the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad offers a way for institutions to remain rational while acknowledging their dependence on sources of norm and telos that logic alone cannot produce. This prepares the ground for the next sections of the article, which show how the architecture can be brought to bear on two domains in which the ideology of pure logic is both powerful and fragile, namely legal rationality and the governance of artificial intelligence.

5. Legal Rationality under Pure Logic and The Cohesive Tetrad

Law is one of the clearest places where the promises and failures of the ideology of pure logic become concrete. Courts and legal systems claim to be guided by reasons, evidence, and procedures rather than by whim or passion. Legal rationality is therefore an ideal testing ground for any architecture of truth governance. If an architecture fails here, it fails where human vulnerability and institutional power most directly meet.

In this section, I first describe how the ideology of pure logic reshapes legal thought and practice. I then identify structural blind spots that appear when legal rationality is centred on pure logic. Finally, I reconstruct legal rationality within the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad, with Sabda, logic, Qualia, Mistika, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment each playing a distinct role. Law becomes a field in which the contrast between the two architectures can be observed rather than merely asserted.

5.1. Law under the ideology of pure logic

When the ideology of pure logic takes hold in legal thought, several tendencies appear together.

Law is first of all reimagined as an autonomous system. Its legitimacy is located primarily in internal coherence and procedural regularity. Rules and precedents are interpreted in ways that preserve systemic consistency. Legal actors learn to think of law as a self contained order that can be justified by its own principles, with minimal reference to any external source of norm and telos. This autonomy is seen as rational because it insulates law from arbitrary shifts in politics and from sectarian appeals to revelation.

At the same time, the separation between facts and values is hardened. Facts are assigned to the realm of evidence, while values are confined to the realm of policy or personal belief. Courts focus on fact finding and rule application, while broader questions about the purposes of law, the shape of a just society, or the meaning of dignity are treated as matters for legislatures or private conscience. Moral and spiritual insight is pushed to the margins or dressed in cautious abstractions.

The language of dignity, rights, and justice does not disappear. On the contrary, it is invoked frequently in constitutional texts, treaties, and judicial opinions. But under the ideology of pure logic, this language tends to be recoded as a sophisticated way of talking about interests and procedures. Dignity becomes a label for certain outcomes after the fact, not a primary source of norm. Rights become tools for balancing competing claims, rather than expressions of an order that judges both state and society.

Finally, the actors inside the legal system are encouraged to understand themselves primarily as technicians of rules. Their task is to interpret texts, weigh evidence, and apply standards in a way that can be defended as formally rational. The cultivation of Akhlak, the formation of character, and the long moral trace of decisions are regarded as private matters. As long as judges and lawyers avoid obvious corruption and follow accepted procedures, the deeper question of what kind of people the system is forming is rarely asked.

This configuration has strengths. It restrains arbitrary authority, encourages consistency, and allows many disputes to be resolved without direct conflict over ultimate beliefs (Fuller, 1964;

Dworkin, 1986; Habermas, 1996). At the same time, it prepares the ground for characteristic failures. By centring legal rationality on pure logic, it trains itself to treat all normativity as derivative, all experience as secondary, and all questions of telos as negotiable.

5.2. Structural blind spots of logic centred legal rationality

When legal rationality is shaped primarily by pure logic, several structural blind spots emerge.

First, there is a tendency toward procedural absolutism. If the legitimacy of law is defined almost entirely by whether the correct procedures have been followed, then deep injustices can be rationalised as acceptable as long as they are "by the book". Decisions that devastate lives can be defended on the ground that the court had no choice once the facts were established and the rules correctly applied. Appeals to mercy, equity, or higher normativity are reframed as dangerous invitations to arbitrariness. In effect, legality and justice are quietly treated as identical, even when their divergence is plain.

Second, the experiences of those who live under the law are easily marginalised. Proceduralism tends to recognise only those voices that fit established categories and forms of evidence. Testimonies that do not match existing scripts are discounted as irrelevant or unreliable. The Qualia of law, the atmosphere it creates in the lives of those who encounter it, is seldom treated as a source of knowledge. As scholarship on epistemic injustice has shown, this leads to patterns in which certain groups are systematically disbelieved or misheard, and in which their suffering does not register as a reason to reconsider the system itself (Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2013).

Third, the moral formation of legal actors is neglected. Judges, prosecutors, police, and lawyers wield significant power over the lives of others. Yet under a logic centred conception, as long as they avoid clear conflicts of interest and gross misconduct, the inner shape of their character is outside the frame of legal rationality. Virtues such as intellectual humility, courage to resist unjust norms, and truthful listening to marginalised voices are treated as admirable extras, not as structural components of the system. Work in virtue epistemology suggests that this neglect undermines the reliability of legal reasoning itself (Zagzebski, 1996; Roberts and Wood, 2007; Baehr, 2011).

Fourth, the concept of dignity becomes hollow. Courts invoke human dignity to limit punishment, to prohibit degrading treatment, or to protect autonomy. Yet if dignity is not anchored in Sabda or an equivalent source of norm and telos, it risks becoming a rhetorical device. In hard cases, arguments about dignity can be used on both sides, and outcomes may depend less on a stable conception of the person than on institutional inertia or political pressure. Over time, dignity can be reinterpreted in ways that accommodate dominant interests rather than protect the vulnerable (Putnam, 2002; MacIntyre, 1988).

These blind spots do not appear because legal actors are unusually wicked. They arise from the architecture itself. When pure logic is given primacy in legal rationality, it narrows the field of what counts as a reason, silences parts of experience that do not fit its categories, and leaves the system without a fully articulated source of norm and telos. The next step is to consider how legal rationality changes when it is repositioned within The Cohesive Tetrad.

5.3. Repositioning legal rationality within The Cohesive Tetrad

When legal rationality is placed inside the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad, the position and function of its elements are reconfigured.

Sabda addresses law first at the level of telos. Law is not simply a set of rules for coordinating behaviour. It is a communal response to the Revelatory Word that names justice, mercy, and protection of the vulnerable as central concerns. Sabda reminds legislators and judges that certain outcomes are unacceptable, even if they could be defended by strict reading of texts or by majority preference. It places limits on punishment, on exploitation, and on the instrumentalisation of persons that cannot be altered by vote.

Logic then takes up its role as disciplined instrument inside this horizon. It is responsible for clarifying the content of legal norms, testing the coherence of statutes and precedents, and ensuring that decisions follow from reasons that can be publicly articulated. Logic preserves many of the achievements of modern legal theory, including demands for transparency, non arbitrariness, and consistency (Fuller, 1964; Dworkin, 1986). The crucial difference is that logic no longer claims to define the whole of legal rationality. It serves a telos it did not invent.

Qualia becomes an acknowledged register of legal truth. The atmosphere in courts, the way victims and accused persons experience proceedings, the patterns of fear or trust that law produces over time, are treated as evidence about the moral quality of the system. Testimonies about humiliation, exclusion, or healing are not mere "feelings" to be bracketed, but signals that the law is either approximating or betraying its professed telos (Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2013). Procedures that consistently produce fear and silence among vulnerable groups call for structural review, even if they are formally impeccable.

Mistika focuses attention on the intention with which legal power is exercised. It asks whether those who make and apply the law do so in a spirit of service to truth and justice, or in a spirit of self protection, status, and control. In The Cohesive Tetrad, careful discernment of intention is not a private exercise. It belongs to truth governance itself. Institutional cultures that reward adversarial victory at all costs, or that normalise indifference to the poor, are recognised as spiritually disordered even when they obey formal rules (Kunda, 1990; Habermas, 1996).

Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment provide the long term diagnostics. They examine what kind of character the legal system forms in its officers and what moral trace it leaves in society. If over decades a legal order produces patterns of honesty, restraint, courage to confront injustice, and careful listening to the weak, its architecture is vindicated. If it consistently generates cynicism, cruelty, and epistemic arrogance, the misalignment between intention and trace reveals an architectural failure, not merely individual lapses (Zagzebski, 1996; Baehr, 2011; Krumrei-Mancuso and Rouse, 2016).

In this repositioning, legal rationality is not less rational. It is more fully rational because it operates with an explicit account of its source of norm and telos, recognises the epistemic status of experience, attends to the spiritual shape of intention, and measures its own moral wake over time.

5.4. Illustrative patterns: procedure, mercy, and structural harm

The difference between the two architectures can be seen in recurring patterns that have confronted legal systems in many jurisdictions. Three such patterns are sufficient to illustrate the contrast.

The first pattern concerns the relationship between procedure and mercy. Under a logic centred architecture, judges may feel that their only legitimate task is to apply the law as written. Requests for leniency, restorative approaches, or creative solutions that take account of the whole life of the offender are treated with suspicion. Mercy is seen as a potential threat to equality before the law. Under The Cohesive Tetrad, the telos of law includes not only retribution and deterrence but restoration. Sabda speaks of justice that does not crush the bruised, and Qualia registers whether sentencing practices produce renewed life or permanent exclusion. Logic is still needed to prevent arbitrary favouritism, but mercy is no longer an alien element. It is part of what law is for.

The second pattern concerns the treatment of those whose experiences do not fit established categories. Victims of certain forms of violence, especially where trauma affects memory and testimony, have often found that legal procedures do not know what to do with their stories. Pure logic tends to treat deviations from expected narrative structure as signs of unreliability. As work on epistemic injustice shows, this creates a double harm: the original injury is compounded by institutional failure to hear it as knowledge (Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2013). Within The Cohesive Tetrad, Qualia gives these experiences a more secure place. Their difficulty is not a reason to ignore them, but a reason to refine categories and evidentiary practices, guided by Sabda's insistence on care for the vulnerable and by Mistika's concern with truthfulness rather than institutional self protection.

The third pattern concerns structural harm. Legal systems can operate for long periods with formally fair procedures while consistently producing outcomes that disadvantage particular groups. Housing laws, policing practices, and sentencing frameworks may all be individually defensible, yet together they create patterns of exclusion that are visible in statistical disparities and in the lived reality of communities. Under pure logic, these patterns can be dismissed as side effects or as the result of non legal factors. Under The Cohesive Tetrad, Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment treat these patterns as part of the truth record. If the trace of law is persistently misaligned with its professed intention to secure justice for all, reform is indicated, not merely an adjustment of rhetoric (O'Neil, 2016; Zuboff, 2019).

These patterns indicate that the shift proposed by The Cohesive Tetrad is not merely conceptual. It changes what counts as a legal problem, what kinds of evidence are admitted, how institutional self examination is conducted, and which questions are considered legitimate. Law becomes a site where Sabda, logic, Qualia, Mistika, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment actively interact, rather than a field governed by logic alone.

5.5. Law as a test field for truth governance

Law is not only one application among others. It is a test field for any serious proposal about truth governance. In law, abstract claims about rationality, dignity, and normativity are forced into contact with concrete cases. Someone must be convicted or acquitted, compensated or

refused, protected or exposed. Decisions cannot be postponed indefinitely. People cannot be left without resolution.

If the ideology of pure logic fails here, the failure is visible in patterns of procedural absolutism, experiential erasure, moral deformation of legal actors, and hollowness in dignity talk. These are not incidental side effects. They are symptoms of an architecture that has tried to make logic bear more weight than it can carry.

If the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad succeeds here, its success will also be visible. Courts will still reason carefully with texts and precedents, but they will do so openly under a telos they did not invent. They will listen more deeply to the experiences of those most affected. They will cultivate Akhlak in their officers and subject their own institutional history to Intention-Trace analysis. Law will be recognised not only as an instrument of order, but as a rough yet genuine image of justice grounded in Sabda.

For the purposes of this article, the role of law is therefore twofold. It provides a concrete arena in which the contrast between pure logic and The Cohesive Tetrad can be observed. It also functions as a proving ground for assessing whether an architecture of truth governance can support institutions that are both rational and humane. In the next section, this proving ground is extended into the rapidly evolving domain of artificial intelligence, where the temptations and dangers of the ideology of pure logic are intensified and where the need for an alternative architecture like The Cohesive Tetrad becomes even more urgent.

6. Artificial Intelligence under Pure Logic and The Cohesive Tetrad

If law is the classical theatre of rationality, artificial intelligence is its newest and most ambitious stage. In artificial intelligence, the ideal of pure logic appears in technological form. Systems are designed to ingest data, apply formal rules or learned parameters, and produce outputs that are presented as rational, objective, and free from human bias. The promise is familiar: if more decisions are delegated to logically disciplined machines, error, inconsistency, and prejudice may be reduced.

Yet the same questions that trouble pure logic in philosophy and law appear, often in sharper form, in artificial intelligence. What grounds the norms that guide these systems. Who defines the goals they optimise. How are human dignity and telos represented, if at all. This section applies the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad to artificial intelligence, first by tracing how the ideology of pure logic shapes artificial intelligence, then by exposing its internal tensions, and finally by sketching how artificial intelligence governance might look when reorganised under Sabda, Logic, Qualia, Mistika, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment.

6.1. Artificial intelligence as the technological dream of pure logic

Many contemporary artificial intelligence systems are built on assumptions that align closely with the ideology of pure logic. The technical details of algorithms vary, but the underlying picture remains remarkably consistent.

Data is treated as the primary source of factual truth. The more data a system can gather, the more accurate its representation of the world is assumed to be. Models are treated as rational mechanisms that transform inputs into outputs through mathematically specified relations.

Evaluation focuses on measurable performance: accuracy, loss functions, error rates, and similar metrics.

Norms and values, when acknowledged, are often represented as constraints on optimisation or as additional terms in an objective function. Fairness, for instance, may be encoded as a penalty for certain disparities between groups. Privacy may be introduced as a requirement that certain data not be used. Harm may be addressed by post hoc filters that block or adjust particular outputs. Ethical guidelines are then interpreted as constraints around an essentially technical core (Mittelstadt et al., 2016; Floridi and Cowls, 2019; Jobin et al., 2019).

In this configuration, artificial intelligence appears as the realisation of pure logic in code. Systems operate according to rules that are transparent to their designers, or at least to those who understand the models. Human actors are invited to trust these systems because they are consistent, scalable, and free from the subjective fluctuations that plague human judgement.

The language used to promote artificial intelligence often reinforces this image. Systems are described as neutral, evidence based, and rational. Human oversight is portrayed as a safety net, but the main appeal lies in the promise of decision making that is more logical than human intuition. The technological dream of pure logic thus becomes a social and economic project.

6.2. Internal tensions in logic centred artificial intelligence

When artificial intelligence is shaped by the ideology of pure logic, several tensions emerge that mirror, intensify, and extend the problems identified earlier.

First, there is a hidden dependence on norm and telos that the system cannot define for itself. Every artificial intelligence model is trained to optimise something: a prediction, a classification, a ranking, a reward. The choice of objective function is not dictated by the data. It is a decision made by designers and institutions. Narrow goals such as click through rates, time on platform, or short term profit may be mathematically convenient, but they do not capture what human beings are for. When systems optimise these proxies without reference to a higher telos, they can be highly rational within their own closed frame and deeply destructive in human terms (O'Neil, 2016; Zuboff, 2019).

Second, the separation between facts and values collapses in practice. Data used to train artificial intelligence systems reflects human histories, institutions, and prejudices. Labels and categories are infused with prior judgements. Decisions about which errors are more tolerable, which trade offs are acceptable, and which harms are serious enough to prevent are all value laden. Yet under the ideology of pure logic, there is pressure to speak as if models simply learn from the world as it is, without normative commitments. In reality, every choice of dataset, label, and performance metric already expresses a view of whose errors matter and whose suffering counts.

Third, the language of dignity is invoked but not grounded. Artificial intelligence ethics frameworks frequently speak of respect for human rights, dignity, autonomy, and non discrimination. However, if the architecture of artificial intelligence is defined entirely within a naturalistic and logic centred frame, these commitments remain external decorations. There is no inner place in the system where the inviolability of persons is structurally recognised. At best, dignity is approximated through constraints and penalties. At worst, it is quietly

subordinated to performance and efficiency when trade offs become difficult (Jobin et al., 2019; OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021).

Fourth, the intentions of those who design and deploy artificial intelligence are often bracketed out of the formal description. Model cards, technical reports, and documentation speak at length about data, architectures, and training, but seldom about the loves and fears that drive the work. Economic incentives, institutional pressures, and personal ambitions are treated as background, even though they can profoundly shape which systems are built, which harms are tolerated, and which communities bear the risk (Kunda, 1990; O'Neil, 2016).

These tensions do not mean that artificial intelligence is inherently corrupt or that logic in code is always harmful. They mean that when artificial intelligence is built and governed under the ideology of pure logic, it inherits the same structural weaknesses: a demand that logic supply what only Sabda can provide, a blindness to the entanglement of facts and values, and a fragile hold on dignity.

6.3. Reframing artificial intelligence within The Cohesive Tetrad

When artificial intelligence is placed inside the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad, the picture changes. Artificial intelligence remains a powerful tool, but it ceases to be the silent sovereign of rationality. It becomes one instrument among many in the task of truth governance.

From the vantage point of Sabda, artificial intelligence systems are not neutral artefacts. They are part of a larger human calling to seek truth, do justice, and protect the vulnerable. Sabda as Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos, addresses artificial intelligence in at least three ways.

It reminds designers and institutions that human beings must never be treated merely as data points, resources, or objects of prediction. It declares that some forms of automated decision making are illegitimate, regardless of efficiency, because they violate the dignity of persons as bearers of a higher telos. It sets outer limits on what may be optimised, even when optimisation appears logically possible.

Logic then takes up its role as instrument within this horizon. In artificial intelligence, this means designing models with clarity about their assumptions, constraints, and domains of validity. It involves scrutinising the inferential structures of algorithms, identifying sources of bias and instability, and ensuring that formal properties align with the values that Sabda commands. Logic becomes the craft of making explicit how systems work, rather than the authority that decides what they should ultimately be for (Mittelstadt et al., 2016).

Qualia enters as the domain that registers how artificial intelligence systems are actually lived. It captures experiences of being scored, recommended, profiled, or denied by systems that appear distant and opaque. It records the effects of automated decisions on trust, social cohesion, exclusion, and fear. These experiences are not mere anecdotes. They are part of the evidential base for judging whether artificial intelligence governance is aligned with its professed telos (O'Neil, 2016; Zuboff, 2019).

Mistika attends to the intention behind artificial intelligence. It asks why certain projects are funded while others are neglected. It asks whether the pursuit of artificial intelligence is guided

by humility and service, or by the desire for dominance, profit, and control. It recognises that the same technical skills can support very different spiritual trajectories: one toward deeper responsiveness to Sabda, another toward idolatry of capability and power.

Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment then provide a long term evaluation of artificial intelligence regimes. Over time, what kind of character do artificial intelligence intensive institutions develop. Do they show increasing care for the vulnerable, transparency, and accountability. Or do they become more opaque, more indifferent to collateral damage, more comfortable with treating persons as data. The gap between declared principles and observable traces is, again, not an external critique. It is a central diagnostic of whether artificial intelligence governance is truthful.

6.4. Practical implications: objectives, constraints, and oversight

Reframing artificial intelligence within The Cohesive Tetrad has practical consequences for how systems are conceived, built, and governed. Several areas reveal especially sharp contrasts with the ideology of pure logic.

First, in the definition of objectives. Under a logic centred view, designers often begin with what is technically feasible and economically attractive. Objectives are then defined in terms of efficiency or predictive power. Within The Cohesive Tetrad, objectives must be filtered through Sabda and Qualia before they are formalised. Some goals, such as maximising engagement without regard to psychological harm, are rejected at the outset. Others are accepted only if they can be embedded within a wider telos that gives priority to human flourishing rather than to metrics alone.

Second, in the design of constraints. Pure logic tends to treat constraints as external additions imposed by regulation or public pressure. The Cohesive Tetrad treats certain constraints as intrinsic to truthful architecture. Limits that protect dignity, preserve meaningful human agency, and prevent certain kinds of surveillance or profiling are not optional extras. They are part of the structure that makes artificial intelligence compatible with the telos of human beings (Floridi and Cowls, 2019; OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021).

Third, in the organisation of oversight. Under pure logic, oversight is often framed entirely in technical terms: audits of bias, robustness checks, verification of performance. These are necessary but not sufficient. Within The Cohesive Tetrad, oversight must also interrogate intention and trace. It must ask who benefits from the system, whose voices were included or excluded in its design, and whether the long term effects on Akhlak are consistent with the proclaimed aims. Evaluation councils, ethics boards, and regulatory bodies are therefore expected to include not only technical experts, but also communities affected by the systems and persons formed in traditions of moral and spiritual discernment.

Fourth, in the status of refusal. A logic centred regime tends to assume that if a system can be built and if it shows high performance, then the burden of proof lies on those who wish to restrict or delay it. A regime shaped by The Cohesive Tetrad reverses that presumption in certain domains. For some applications, such as automated decisions that deeply affect life, liberty, or the core of personal identity, the burden of proof lies on those who wish to hand power to machines. Sabda and Qualia may together indicate that certain capacities should

remain with human agents who are directly accountable, even if machines could in principle perform the tasks more cheaply or consistently.

These implications do not amount to a technical blueprint. They are architectural constraints and priorities. They state that artificial intelligence governance must be built from the beginning with Sabda, Qualia, Mistika, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment in view, not added later as decorations around a core of pure logic.

6.5. Artificial intelligence as amplifier of existing architectures

Artificial intelligence, in the end, amplifies the architecture of truth governance that already exists in a society. If the prevailing regime is shaped by the ideology of pure logic, artificial intelligence will tend to deepen that regime. It will extend the reach of narrow optimisation, entrench the separation of facts and values, and accelerate the erosion of substantive dignity.

If the prevailing regime begins to adopt the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad, artificial intelligence can be directed and constrained in ways that support, rather than undermine, the integrity of truth. Systems will still optimise, classify, and predict, but they will do so under a telos they did not invent, with attention to lived experience, purified intention, and long term moral trace.

This insight strengthens the central thesis of the article. The real conflict is not between humans and machines, nor between tradition and technology. It is between different architectures of truth. Pure logic, when given sovereignty, leads rationality to fight against the very sources of norm and telos that it needs. The Cohesive Tetrad proposes a different arrangement, in which Sabda remains primary and logic, in its coded and uncoded forms, is restored to its right place as a powerful servant of a higher calling.

7. Objections and Replies

Any proposal that restores Sabda to a structurally primary role in truth governance will attract serious objections. The ideology of pure logic did not emerge in a vacuum. It grew, in part, out of hard lessons about religious conflict, authoritarian misuse of revelation, and the fragility of social peace. If The Cohesive Tetrad is to be taken seriously in a logic sensitive academic forum, it must face those lessons directly.

In this section, I consider five families of objections that arise naturally once Sabda is placed at the centre of an architecture that still claims to honour rationality.

1. The pluralism objection.
2. The public reason objection.
3. The authoritarianism objection.
4. The “which Sabda” and relativism objection.
5. The instrumentalisation objection.

Each objection presses on a real vulnerability. None can be dismissed by appeal to authority alone. The task is to show that the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad has internal resources to respond in ways that are intelligible and compelling, not only to those who already share its

deepest commitments, but also to those who care about law, artificial intelligence, and human dignity in plural societies.

7.1. The pluralism objection

The first objection begins from a sociological and political fact. Contemporary societies are religiously and morally diverse. Citizens are formed by multiple traditions, including explicitly secular ones. In that context, the claim that Sabda, the Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos, should have structural primacy in public architectures of truth appears to some as a recipe for renewed domination. If one community's Sabda is given priority, does that not simply reinstall the very problem The Cohesive Tetrad claims to solve: the rule of one group's deepest convictions over others.

The architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad offers a layered response.

First, it distinguishes between a structural claim and a substantive claim. The structural claim is that some form of Sabda, some sense that norm and telos are received rather than manufactured, is unavoidable in any regime that takes human dignity seriously. Even strongly secular frameworks, when they treat dignity and rights as unconditional, in practice appeal to an authority that transcends shifting preference and power, even if they refuse to name it as Sabda (Putnam, 2002; Habermas, 1996; UNESCO, 2021). The substantive claim, by contrast, concerns which concrete interpretation of Sabda should guide a given community. The architecture insists that the first claim can be defended without prematurely settling the second.

Second, the architecture gives logic a non trivial role in mediating between competing claims. Different traditions advance different accounts of norm and telos. The fact that they appeal to Sabda does not exempt them from rational scrutiny. Logic examines internal coherence, compatibility with minimal human dignity axioms, and the consistency between professed telos and observable trace. Traditions that systematically undermine the very dignity they proclaim, or that cannot give an account of their own norms without contradiction, reveal themselves as unstable candidates for truth governance.

Third, Qualia and Akhlak introduce empirical and moral tests over time. Communities that live under different interpretations of Sabda generate different atmospheres, patterns of harm and healing, and trajectories of character. These long term fruits are not infallible indicators, but they are part of the evidence about which interpretations are life giving and which intensify domination and self deception (Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2013; Zagzebski, 1996; Baehr, 2011). Pluralism is not resolved by abstract comparison alone. It is addressed through the comparative evaluation of long term fruits.

Fourth, The Cohesive Tetrad does not require that all citizens consciously endorse the same thick theology of Sabda. It is possible to distinguish between the architecture of institutions and the interior lives of persons. At the institutional level, Sabda can inform constitutional limits and human rights frameworks in a way that is compatible with overlapping ethical convictions, even among those who do not share the same religious narrative (Habermas, 1996). At the personal level, citizens can continue to interpret those limits through their own traditions and reasons. Logic plays an important role in identifying and stabilising these zones of overlap.

The pluralism objection therefore reveals a genuine tension, but not a fatal one. It shows that the architecture must acknowledge pluralism and resist triumphalism. It does not show that a logic centred framework, which hides its dependence on unacknowledged fragments of Sabda, is more honest or more stable.

7.2. The public reason objection

A second objection concerns public accessibility. Modern doctrines of public reason argue that in diverse societies, political justification should be grounded in reasons that all citizens can, in principle, accept, regardless of their comprehensive doctrines. References to revelation are often treated as privately meaningful but publicly inadmissible. From this angle, The Cohesive Tetrad looks problematic. If Sabda holds structural primacy, does that not violate the demand that citizens be able to justify coercive laws in terms their neighbours can share.

Here it is crucial to distinguish several levels.

At the deepest level, every comprehensive doctrine, including secular liberalism, rests on commitments that are not derivable from neutral premises. Convictions about the equal moral worth of persons, about the priority of liberty, or about the necessity of public justification are themselves ethical theses that cannot be established by logic and empirical evidence alone. The claim that citizens must be able to justify laws to one another in shared terms is already a normative commitment, not a pure deliverance of reason (Habermas, 1996; Putnam, 2002).

At the level of institutional practice, however, it remains important that coercive laws be justifiable to those who do not share the same explicit theology of Sabda. The Cohesive Tetrad can accommodate this by adopting a two level approach to public reason.

At the foundational level, scholars, judges, and policymakers are explicit about the deep commitments that inform their understanding of human beings and ultimate limits, including their reliance on Sabda as the authoritative source of norm and telos. These commitments are articulated and defended in full, without pretending to be neutral.

At the operational level, when laws and policies are debated and applied, reasons are offered in terms that are accessible across traditions, provided they are coherent with the deeper commitments and do not smuggle in interests that cannot be justified even on their own terms. Arguments about the wrongness of torture, the impermissibility of degrading treatment, or the need to protect vulnerable groups can be made in a language of dignity and harm that interlocutors from multiple traditions can grasp, even if their ultimate theologies differ (Habermas, 1996; UNESCO, 2021).

The demand of public reason thus becomes not a prohibition against Sabda, but a discipline of translation and humility. It requires that those who act from Sabda be willing to explain and defend their proposals in a way that others can follow and contest. Pure logic does not have a monopoly on public accessibility. What matters is whether the reasons offered can be understood, not whether they are rooted in an allegedly neutral metaphysics.

7.3. The authoritarianism objection

A third objection warns that any architecture which grants primacy to Sabda risks sliding into authoritarianism. History contains many examples of religious authorities who claimed to speak for revelation and used that claim to crush dissent, justify violence, and shield themselves from accountability. Placing Sabda at the centre of truth governance may seem to many like building a more elaborate vocabulary for theocracy.

The danger is real. The Cohesive Tetrad does not deny the long record of misuse. It proposes, however, that precisely because revelation can be misused, it should be placed within an architecture that multiplies checks rather than removing them.

First, Sabda in this framework is not self validating at the level of human interpretation. That Sabda is Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos, does not mean that any group's claim to represent it is automatically true. Interpretations must be tested by logic for coherence, by minimal human dignity axioms for compatibility, and by their long term fruits for integrity. A regime that appeals to Sabda but systematically degrades persons fails this test.

Second, Qualia functions as a public alarm. If a regime that claims to act in the name of Sabda produces widespread fear, humiliation, and silence among ordinary people, those experiences are relevant evidence. They are not merely emotional reactions. They reveal that the way Sabda is being interpreted and institutionalised may be distorted. Qualia gathers these testimonies and brings them into the field of judgement (Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2013).

Third, Mistika insists on scrutiny of intention. Leaders who invoke Sabda are not granted automatic presumption of purity. Their motives, patterns of life, and responses to criticism fall under examination. Appeals to revelation that are combined with a consistent pattern of self exaltation, contempt for the weak, and refusal of correction are recognised as spiritually disordered. The Cohesive Tetrad brings motive back into the field of governance rather than leaving it to private morality.

Fourth, Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment subject claims to long term evaluation. It is not enough for a regime to state noble principles. Its history must show growth in virtues such as justice, mercy, and truthfulness. Where there is persistent divergence between professed telos and actual trace, the architecture itself is indicted. Over time, this trace speaks more loudly than official rhetoric (Zagzebski, 1996; Roberts and Wood, 2007; Baehr, 2011).

These checks do not make authoritarianism impossible. Human freedom includes the capacity to distort even the best architectures. They do, however, make it harder to sacralise arbitrary power. In contrast, a system that treats pure logic or technical expertise as sovereign can also become authoritarian, but with fewer internal resources for critique, because it has no recognised standard that stands above its calculations.

7.4. The "which Sabda" and relativism objection

A fourth objection presses the question of specificity. Even if one grants that some form of Sabda is structurally necessary, the world contains many claimed Revelatory Words. Within and across traditions, interpretations differ sharply. Who decides which Sabda is true. Does not

the appeal to Sabda simply shift the problem of relativism to a higher level, where each group centres its own version and declares itself justified.

The architecture answers in two stages.

First, it insists on comparative testing. Different claimed Sabda and their associated interpretations can be compared along several dimensions: their internal coherence, their compatibility with minimal human dignity axioms, their capacity to support stable recognition of the equal worth of persons, and their long term Akhlak and Qualia trace. Traditions that endorse cruelty, deny basic equality, or consistently produce patterns of domination and fear are not on a par with those that generate humility, protection of the vulnerable, and readiness to self correct (MacIntyre, 1988; Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2013).

These tests do not produce a mechanical ranking that all parties must accept. They do provide a framework in which rational conversation about "which Sabda" can proceed, rather than collapsing into slogan and force. The fact that deep disagreement remains does not mean that nothing can be said. It means that the work of comparative discernment is long and demanding.

Second, the architecture allows for differentiated roles of Sabda at different levels of political life. At the deepest level, communities may continue to live out their particular articulations of Sabda in worship, teaching, and moral formation. At the civic level, institutions may be structured around minimal affirmations that can be endorsed from multiple angles, such as the unconditional worth of every person and the impermissibility of certain kinds of harm. These affirmations can be seen, from within different traditions, as partial articulations of their own Sabda, without requiring forced homogenisation. This avoids both the illusion that all claims are equally valid and the temptation to impose one thick tradition as the sole public norm (Habermas, 1996; UNESCO, 2021).

Relativism, in the strict sense that all claims are equally valid, is therefore rejected. The Cohesive Tetrad affirms the possibility and necessity of strong judgements, tempered by humility and tested by time.

7.5. The instrumentalisation objection

A final objection comes from another direction. It worries that by placing Sabda inside an architecture, The Cohesive Tetrad turns revelation into a mere instrument. Sabda becomes one component in a human designed framework, subject to analysis and systematisation. For believers, this looks like a loss of transcendence. Sabda should judge all architectures, not be enclosed within one.

This objection is important, especially for readers who belong to traditions that regard revelation as living and sovereign. The response of The Cohesive Tetrad lies in recognising the difference between two levels of discourse.

The first level is confessional. Here Sabda is not an element in a conceptual scheme, but the living Word that calls, commands, and comforts. At this level, any human framework, including The Cohesive Tetrad, is provisional and revisable. Sabda retains the right to overturn, revise, or discard any human construction that presumes to capture it.

The second level is analytic. Here we ask how different domains of truth function in practice and how they can be arranged so that institutions honour rather than betray the telos of human beings. At this level, The Cohesive Tetrad is offered as a model for thinking about truth governance that gives Sabda structural primacy and provides explicit roles for logic, Qualia, Mistika, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment. It does not claim to exhaust the mystery of Sabda. It claims only to articulate a way in which Sabda can govern institutions without relying on unchecked human authority or on silent assumptions.

Seen in this light, The Cohesive Tetrad is not a prison for revelation. It is an attempt to design institutional and intellectual space that remains open to being judged by Sabda, while protecting communities from both authoritarian misuse of revelation and the quieter absolutism of pure logic. Its own adequacy is subject to the same tests it applies to other frameworks: coherence, fidelity to minimal dignity axioms, responsiveness to Qualia, purity of Mistika, and the long term Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment of those who adopt it.

7.6. Summary

The objections considered in this section are not peripheral. They arise precisely at the points where the architecture of The Cohesive Tetrad might appear most vulnerable: pluralism, public reason, the risk of authoritarianism, the problem of "which Sabda", and the danger of turning revelation into an instrument. The responses offered do not claim to close these debates. They aim to show that the architecture contains resources to engage them without retreating into either dogmatism or scepticism.

Pluralism is acknowledged and addressed through layered claims, comparative testing, and differentiated roles for Sabda. Public reason is reframed as a discipline of translation and humility, not as a ban on deep commitments. Authoritarianism is resisted by building multiple internal checks on interpretation and power. The "which Sabda" question is faced through long term comparative discernment and overlapping civic affirmations. The risk of instrumentalisation is answered by distinguishing confessional and analytic levels and by insisting that even this architecture remains under the judgement of Sabda.

Taken together, these replies do not remove all grounds for concern. They do, however, suggest that the choice is not between pure logic and unaccountable revelation. The more promising alternative is an architecture in which Sabda, logic, Qualia, Mistika, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment are bound together in a disciplined way. The final section draws together the threads of the argument and indicates directions for further research on truth governance under this architecture.

8. Conclusion

This article has asked a simple but unforgiving question. Can the ideology of pure logic, which aspires to govern truth by reason and evidence alone, sustain the weight that contemporary institutions place upon it. The answer has been negative. When examined from within its own standards, pure logic reveals structural weaknesses. It cannot ground its own norms without covert trust. It cannot maintain a strict separation between facts and values in practice. It cannot provide a robust account of human dignity while remaining within a narrow naturalistic frame. Yet these are precisely the dimensions in which modern law and artificial intelligence must be most reliable.

On the way to this conclusion, the article has unfolded in several steps. First, it reconstructed the ideology of pure logic as a serious and attractive architecture. Scientism, hard evidentialism, a hard fact value divide, and strong naturalism about telos and dignity were presented not as straw men, but as coherent tendencies that have migrated from philosophy into institutional common sense. Pure logic presents itself as a guardian against arbitrariness, superstition, and sectarian conflict. It offers a vision of public life organised around reasons that all can in principle inspect. That aspiration was acknowledged as historically understandable and morally significant.

Second, the article developed an internal critique. Without appealing to external authority, it showed how pure logic depends on forms of trust, normativity, and depth that it cannot generate on its own. It rests on basic commitments about the intelligibility of reality and the worth of truth that are not deduced from prior premises. It operates within practices whose categories and standards are already value laden. It borrows the language of dignity and inviolable worth, then struggles to explain why such language should be taken at face value. The problem is not that logic is irrational, but that an ideology which elevates logic to the status of sole sovereign asks it to perform tasks that exceed its mandate.

Third, the article introduced The Cohesive Tetrad as an alternative architecture of truth governance. Rather than treating truth as a monolingual regime, it articulated a multi domain configuration in which Sabda, Logic, Qualia, Mistika, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment each have a defined role. Sabda, as Revelatory Word, the authoritative source of norm and telos, provides the horizon within which questions of purpose and dignity are first posed. Logic clarifies and tests, but does not legislate telos. Qualia registers the lived consequences of regimes of truth. Mistika attends to the orientation of intention in inquiry and governance. Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment supply longitudinal diagnostics, asking whether the moral character and trace of institutions align with their professed aims. Taken together, these domains form an architecture that preserves the strengths of logical discipline while correcting its overreach.

Fourth, the article brought this architecture into contact with two crucial fields, law and artificial intelligence. In law, it showed how a logic centred conception of legal rationality tends toward procedural absolutism, experiential erasure, neglect of character, and hollowing out of dignity. By repositioning legal rationality inside The Cohesive Tetrad, it became possible to affirm the achievements of legality while insisting that telos, lived experience, spiritual intention, and long term moral trace are structurally relevant to the evaluation of legal systems. In artificial intelligence, a similar pattern emerged. Pure logic, translated into code, produces systems that optimise narrow objectives while obscuring their dependence on prior value judgements and institutional intentions. Under The Cohesive Tetrad, artificial intelligence is reframed as an instrument that must be oriented by Sabda, constrained by dignity, informed by Qualia, purified by Mistika, and evaluated by Akhlak and Intention-Trace Alignment.

Fifth, the article faced a series of major objections. Concerns about pluralism, public reason, authoritarian misuse of revelation, the problem of “which Sabda”, and the risk of instrumentalising revelation were addressed directly. The responses were not offered as final victories, but as demonstrations that the architecture can engage these objections without retreating into dogmatic assertion or sceptical resignation. The key move was to distinguish between the structural claim that some order of norm and telos beyond mere preference is necessary for stable recognition of dignity, and the substantive work of discerning how particular traditions of Sabda can shape public life under conditions of diversity and fallibility.

The central theoretical contribution of this article is therefore architectural. It does not propose a new decision rule, a new algorithm, or a new doctrinal formula. It proposes a different way of arranging the domains of truth in relation to each other. In this arrangement, logic is neither dethroned nor deified. It is honoured as an indispensable craft that keeps claims honest, but is prevented from silently displacing the very sources of norm and telos that make its own practice meaningful. The Cohesive Tetrad offers a vocabulary and a framework in which this arrangement can be made explicit, debated, and refined.

The practical contribution lies in the way this architecture can inform ongoing debates in legal and artificial intelligence governance. For law, it suggests criteria for evaluating reforms that go beyond procedural tidiness, asking how changes will affect the Qualia of those who live under the law and the Akhlak of those who administer it. For artificial intelligence, it offers a way to interpret existing ethics guidelines and regulatory proposals in terms of their implicit commitments about Sabda, telos, and dignity, and to identify where these commitments remain underdeveloped or inconsistent. In both fields, the architecture invites a shift from ad hoc balancing of values to a more principled account of how different domains of truth interact.

This article is a beginning, not a conclusion. Several avenues for further research are obvious. The minimal human dignity axioms used here as a normative baseline require more detailed formulation and testing across legal and technological contexts. The application of The Cohesive Tetrad to other domains, such as education, economic policy, or environmental governance, remains to be explored. Empirical and historical work is needed to examine how different institutional arrangements embody, distort, or resist the architecture proposed here. Philosophical engagement with competing accounts of normativity and revelation can refine both the strengths and the limits of the framework.

What the analysis has made difficult to deny is this: the ideology of pure logic, taken as an exclusive architecture of truth governance, cannot carry the moral, legal, and technological burdens placed upon it. It will either collapse into scepticism or continue to rely, unacknowledged, on fragments of Sabda that it refuses to name. The alternative sketched here does not offer an easy settlement. It does, however, propose a way of letting Sabda remain what it claims to be, while allowing logic, Qualia, Mistika, Akhlak, and Intention-Trace Alignment to exercise their proper offices. For institutions that wish to remain rational and humane in an age of law and artificial intelligence, that architectural shift may be less an option than a requirement.

References

Baehr, J. S. (2011). *The inquiring mind: On intellectual virtues and virtue epistemology*. Oxford University Press.

Dworkin, R. (1986). *Law's empire*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review, 1*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.

Fuller, L. L. (1964). *The morality of law*. Yale University Press.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. MIT Press.

Haack, S. (2003). *Defending science within reason: Between scientism and cynicism*. Prometheus Books.

John, L. K., Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (2012). Measuring the prevalence of questionable research practices with incentives for truth telling. *Psychological Science, 23*(5), 524-532. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611430953

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*(9), 389-399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2

Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J., & Rouse, S. V. (2016). The development and validation of the Comprehensive Intellectual Humility Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 98*(2), 209-221. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2015.1068174

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(3), 480-498. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.480

MacIntyre, A. (1988). *Whose justice? Which rationality?* University of Notre Dame Press.

Medina, J. (2013). *The epistemology of resistance: Gender and racial oppression, epistemic injustice, and resistant imaginations*. Oxford University Press.

Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society, 3*(2), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679

Mutaqin, A. Z. (2025a). *The Cohesive Tetrad: Jalan Menuju Kebenaran*. OSF Preprints. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/D5S7V

Mutaqin, A. Z. (2025b). The Cohesive Tetrad as an epistemic-ethical framework for truth governance under minimal human dignity axioms. OSF Preprints / PhilArchive. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/D5S7V

Nasr, S. H. (1989). *Knowledge and the sacred*. State University of New York Press.

OECD. (2019). *Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence* (OECD/LEGAL/0449). Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.

Putnam, H. (2002). *The collapse of the fact/value dichotomy and other essays*. Harvard University Press.

Roberts, R. C., & Wood, W. J. (2007). *Intellectual virtues: An essay in regulative epistemology*. Oxford University Press.

UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Zagzebski, L. T. (1996). *Virtues of the mind: An inquiry into the nature of virtue and the ethical foundations of knowledge*. Cambridge University Press.